

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled or added.

Claims 1, 11, 12, 13, 23, 24, 25 and 31 are currently being amended.

This amendment and reply amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-31 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 10-19 and 22-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,920,870 to Briscoe et al.; and claims 8, 9, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Briscoe et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,382 to Bowman-Amuah. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

Presently pending independent claim 1 has been amended to recite:

wherein the business level objects and the application level objects are respectively stored as a plurality of nodes at different levels of abstraction, with correlations between the application level objects and the business level objects being accomplished by linking one or more nodes of the application level objects to one or more nodes of the business level objects at different levels of abstraction, and

wherein the source data is linked to one or more of the plurality of nodes.

See, for example, the description on page 9 of the specification and Figures 1-3 of the drawings. Briscoe et al. describes a multi-layer abstraction bucket mechanism that connects application programs and at least one data source, whereby Briscoe et al. does not disclose or suggest the above-highlighted features of presently pending independent claim 1.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 1, as well as presently pending independent claims 13, 25 and 31 that have been amended in a manner similar to the amendments made to claim 1, are not anticipated by Briscoe et al.

Furthermore, with respect to dependent claims 11 and 23, those claims now recite:

wherein the step of displaying the stored data associated with both business level objects and the application level objects comprises:

displaying, on a first display screen, one or more of the business level objects as connected links; and

displaying, as connected links on a second display screen when one of the connected links on the first display screen is selected by a user, one or more of the application level objects that are correlated with the one or more of the business level objects.

While Figure 3 shows the connecting of application objects and bucket data objects, it fails to meet the specific features recited in dependent claims 11 and 23.

Accordingly, dependent claims 11 and 23 are not anticipated by Briscoe et al. for these additional reasons.

Still further, with respect to claims 12 and 24 (which depend from claims 11 and 23, respectively), those claims now recite:

displaying, as connected links on a third display screen when one of the connected links on the second display screen is selected by a user, one or more of a lower level of application level objects that are correlated with the one or more of the application level objects displayed on the second display screen.

Briscoe et al. does not disclose or suggest such a third display screen of application level objects that provides a drill down from a second display screen of application level objects.

Accordingly, dependent claims 12 and 24 are not anticipated by Briscoe et al. for these additional reasons.

It is also noted that Bowman-Amuah, which was applied against claims 8, 9, 20 and 21, does not rectify the above-mentioned deficiencies of Briscoe et al., and thus all of the presently pending claims are patentable over the combined teachings of those two references.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 26, 2006

By Phillip J. Articola

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer No.: 22879
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819